

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan Application Publication 2000-035847 to Hitoshi (hereinafter "Hitoshi") and U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371 to Oran et al. ("Oran").

Applicants amend the claims herewith to clarify the claimed invention. No new matter is added, the claims being fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, FIGS. 1, 3, and 5-8 with their corresponding description.

Hitoshi discloses a system which controls whether application windows (21a, 21a, 21c) displayed on a main screen (21) are displayed in sub-displays (22-24) using the buttons D1, D2, D3 and "Swap" (see Abstract and FIGS. 8-12 of Hitoshi).

Oran discloses a taskbar which supplies "visual cues" for applications having an active window.

According to claim 1, an information processing apparatus controls image data of which among a plurality of windows displays is displayed on **single** external monitor using "an external monitor output selection menu" that a processing unit of the claimed information processing apparatus displays "in a menu bar of each of the plural window displays."

The cited prior art fails to anticipate or render obvious a processing unit that "displays an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each of the plural window displays, to select whether said image data of said window is output to said external monitor by said processing unit to be displayed" as recited in claim 1. Hitoshi merely discloses buttons that correspond to the sub-displays (i.e. different sub-displays not a single external monitor as in claim 1), and that, when pushed, determine displaying of the content of an active window in the corresponding sub-display. (The "swap" button of Hitoshi has a more complex effect, but additional explanations do not add to the present argument so are presently omitted.) The "visual clues" of Oran are related only to the display device and not to an external monitor.

Further, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art by reciting that "for each of the plural windows, said processing unit checks which item of the external monitor output selection menu corresponding to the window display is selected, and outputs the image data of the specified window to said external monitor according to a result of checking." This added feature is supported, for example, by the description on pages 11-12 of the specification.

Therefore amended independent claim 1 and claims 3-5, 7 and 17 depending from claim 1 patentably distinguish over Hitoshi and Oran.

Relative to claim 3, the Office Action alleges that FIG. 8 and paragraph [0033] of the translation of Hitoshi disclose that "said processing unit outputs image data of a single effective window." FIG. 8 in Hitoshi illustrates that a same active window C is displayed on the three sub-displays 22-24. Paragraph [0033] of Hitoshi discusses the use of a stylus may be used to establish the window buttons correspondences. Thus, the indicated portions of Hitoshi and the whole disclosure therein do not actually anticipate or render obvious claim 3.

In view of the above discussion, amended independent claim 8 and claims 10-12, 14 and 18 depending from claim 8 patentable distinguish over the cited prior art at least because claim 8 recites:

- said displaying comprises displaying an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each window of the display device to select whether image data of said window is output to said external monitor, and
- said outputting includes checking which item of the external monitor output selection menu corresponding to the window is selected, and outputting the image data of the selected window to said external monitor according to a result of the checking.

Additionally claim 18 as clarified patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art by reciting that "said external monitor output menu includes an item that indicates that the image data of the window is always output to said external monitor and an item that indicates that the image data of the window display is output to said external monitor when effective on the display device."

Amended independent claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting:

- said displaying comprises displaying an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each window of the display device to select whether image data of said window is output to said external monitor to be displayed, and

- said outputting includes checking which item of the external monitor output selection menu corresponding to the window is selected, and outputting the image data of the selected window to said external monitor according to a result of the checking.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to the effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 14, 2008

By: 
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501